SEMINAR ORGANISED BY THE ITALIAN COUNCIL OF STATE IN
COLLABORATION WITH THE HELLENIC COUNCIL OF STATE AND ACA-EUROPE
Turin, 23-24 November 2026

Technological challenges, with particular attention being paid to the introduction of digital technology and artificial intelligence into the organisation of the administration and administrative justice

QUESTIONNAIRE

Responses from _____ (Please indicate your institution)

This questionnaire has been prepared in anticipation of the seminar to be held in Turin on 23 and 24 November 2026. In accordance with point 2 of the guiding principles adopted by the Hellenic Presidency of ACA-Europe, it aims to explore the current challenges facing administrative judges, particularly those related to technology, and more specifically the introduction of digitalisation and artificial intelligence into the organisation and functioning of the administration and administrative justice.

In order to gain an in-depth understanding of the various dimensions of these technological challenges, the survey is split into three parts:

Part A - The digitalisation of administrative proceedings, with a focus on the experience of various supreme administrative jurisdictions and the impact of this transformation on the organisation and conduct of judicial activity.

Part B - Automated administrative decision-making and judicial review by administrative courts, particularly issues of technical discretion, automation and the delimitation of judicial powers.

Part C - The role of the administrative judge and the use of artificial intelligence in the performance of judicial functions and in the decision-making process, particularly in light of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689, known as the 'AI Act', as well as other European Union standards and regulations, such as Regulation (EU) 2016/679, known as the 'GDPR', Regulation (EU) 2022/2065, known as the 'DSA', and Regulation (EU) 2022/1925, known as the 'DMA'.

Co-funded by the European Union

Part A
The digitalisation of administrative proceedings and the use of artificial intelligence tools by the administrative justice system

A.I – Infrastructure and technological organisation

A.I.1 – Digital equipment and resources

1. What is the level of digital equipment available to judges and administrative staff?

☐ Non-existent
☐ Limited
☐ Intermediate
X☐ High
☐ Complete
Please explain if necessary:

Each judge of the Supreme Administrative Court ("SAC") has access to hardware and software that allows them to connect securely and continuously, no matter where he or she is. This equipment includes:

– a desktop computer with a secured connection to the internet and access to the internal systems of the court
– a network printer;
– dual monitors (on request);
– a laptop, a tablet and a work smartphone (on request) with mobile data connectivity;
– a remote digital signature;
– an institutional email account;
– access to the Microsoft Office 365 suite.

Judicial assistants and administrative staff are provided with similar equipment to that of judges, with certain exceptions; for instance, they are not issued with tablets or remote digital signature capabilities.

2. Is the technological infrastructure (networks, servers, equipment, connectivity) suited to the day-to-day operational needs of the administrative jurisdictions?

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Somewhat disagree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
X☐ Somewhat agree
☐ Strongly agree

Please explain if necessary:

Co-funded by the European Union

The internal infrastructure of the court is robust and supports the transition to digital workflows. High-capacity on-premise servers ensure data security and stability. However, it should be noted that remote connectivity is managed centrally by the Ministry of Justice and occasionally experiences technical disruptions, which can intermittently affect off-site access to internal systems.

A.I.2 – Cloud solutions, remote access and interoperability

3. To what extent does your jurisdiction use cloud-based solutions for its information systems?

? ☐ Not at all
X☐ To a limited extent
☐ Moderately
☐ Extensively
☐ Completely

Please explain, where applicable, and, in the absence of cloud solutions, specify the alternative infrastructure solutions implemented:

The SAC utilises cloud-based solutions specifically within the Microsoft 365 suite for productivity and collaboration (primarily e-mail and MS Teams). However, the core judicial information systems run exclusively on-premise, utilising either the court's internal servers or the centralised infrastructure of the Ministry of Justice.

3a. Do the adopted technical solutions enable judges and staff to perform their duties remotely using the institutional equipment made available to them? If so, please specify any limitations.

Yes, personnel can work remotely using institutional hardware to access internal systems. As remote access is managed centrally by the Ministry of Justice, any technical issues at the ministerial level may result in temporary connectivity restrictions.

3b. Are the applications being used interoperable with other national or cross-border judicial IT systems? If so, please specify the extent of this interoperability.

Interoperability is currently limited. Regional administrative courts have restricted access to the SAC's internal systems and digital documentation, enabling them to view specific segments of the records.

A.II – Digitalisation and dematerialisation of judicial administrative proceedings

A.II.1 – Dematerialised administrative proceedings

4. Is a dematerialised judicial administrative proceedings system in place within your jurisdiction?

☐ No
X ☐ Yes, at an initial stage

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ Yes, at an intermediate stage
☐ Yes, at an advanced stage
☐ Yes, on a fully integrated basis
Please explain if necessary:

The Czech Republic is now slowly moving towards a fully digitized case file system in public administration ("e-Správa"), which would also be electronically accessible by the courts. Currently, the project is in the public procurement phase.

4a. When this system exists at least at an initial stage, do judges and staff process and sign documents exclusively in digital format in their everyday working practice?

☐ Never
☐ Rarely
☐ Occasionally
X ☐ Frequently
☐ Always

Please explain if necessary:

Documents created by the court are managed and signed in digital form. Electronic signatures are used systematically by judges and staff as part of digital workflows.

4b. Percentage of paper files prior to the implementation of dematerialised administrative proceedings that have been digitised:

☐ 0–20%

☐ 20–40%

☐ 40–65%

X ☐ 60–80%

☐ 80–100%

A.II.2 – Digital services for members of the public, lawyers and public authorities
5. Are digital services available for filing documents, consulting files, notifications, payments or other related services? If so, please specify which ones.

The SAC accepts documents in digital form via the Data Box Information System, via the court's email address and via the Ministry of Justice's ePodatelna (e-filing) web application. The court also uses digital official notice board on the court's website. It is also possible to pay the court fees via QR code. On the other hand, the process of consulting files has not been digitalised yet.

Co-funded by the European Union

6. Do these digital services guarantee an adequate level of accessibility for people with disabilities?

☐ 0–20%

☐ 20–40%

☐ 40–65%

X ☐ 60–80%

☐ 80 - 100%

7. Are lawyers involved in the design, development and implementation of digital platforms and tools intended for their use?
If so, please specify the terms of this involvement.

Generally, digital projects within the administrative justice system are led by the Ministry of Justice in collaboration with court staff, including representatives of both the judges and the administrative personnel.
Practising lawyers, as the primary end-users, are typically not involved in the initial design or preparation phases of the tools intended for their use. However, they can provide valuable feedback following the implementation of these systems, which is subsequently considered and reflected in ongoing updates and refinements.

8. Are there any support and training measures in place for users outside the court system (lawyers, members of the public, government agencies) regarding the use of the digital tools available to them?
☐ YES
X ☐ NO

If so, please specify which ones

A.III – Security of information systems and data protection

A.III.1 – Compliance with the regulatory framework

9. Do your jurisdiction's information systems comply with European and national standards on security, data protection and digital preservation?

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Agree only slightly
☐ Indifferent
☐ Somewhat agree
X ☐ Strongly agree

Please explain if necessary:

A.III.2 – Incident management and business continuity

Co-funded by the European Union

10. Are IT security incidents dealt with promptly and effectively?
☐ Never
☐ Rarely
☐ Occasionally
☐ Frequently
X ☐ Always

11. Are business continuity and disaster recovery plans regularly updated and tested?

☐ Never
☐ Rarely
☐ Occasionally
X ☐ Frequently
☐ Always

A.III.3 – Publicity and dissemination of court decisions

12. Are court decisions available online in their entirety?

☐ Never
☐ Rarely (only for the most significant decisions)
☐ Occasionally
☐ Frequently
X ☐ Always

Please add any additional information and explain if necessary:

The SAC maintains a public case-law database providing free access to the full text of all anonymised judgments issued by both the SAC and the regional administrative courts. This system includes advanced search functionality based on a wide range of criteria, such as ECLI identifiers, keywords, and specific legal provisions.

13. Where a system for publishing decisions online is in place, is there an internal policy to ensure the protection of personal data and respect for the right to be forgotten?

☐ No
☐ No formalised policy; anonymisation is carried out by the registry services on a case-by-case basis
☐ No formalised policy; anonymisation is decided on a case-by-case basis on the instructions of judges
X ☐ Yes, personal data are systematically anonymised
X ☐ Yes, personal data are anonymised in accordance with an internal policy providing for targeted exceptions

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ Other (please specify)

A.IV – Training and digital skills

14. Does your jurisdiction offer structured and regularly updated digital technology training courses for judges and staff?

If so, please specify which ones.

The Czech Republic provides various digital technology training courses for the judiciary. The Judicial Academy of the Czech Republic (the central training body for the judiciary) organises professional development programmes, including specialised seminars such as "The Use of Artificial Intelligence in the Judiciary", which are held several times a year. These sessions are designed to keep legal professionals informed about the latest technological advancements and their practical application within the legal framework. Furthermore, the Ministry of Justice manages a cybersecurity awareness programme. On an annual basis, the Ministry provides updated educational materials for all judges and court administrative staff. Completion of this training is followed by a mandatory cybersecurity assessment (test), which ensures that all personnel maintain a high level of digital security competence and are prepared to mitigate potential cyber threats.

A.V – Involvement of judges in digital transformation

15. To what extent are judges involved in decision-making and design processes relating to technological innovation and digital transformation in the judiciary? If applicable, please provide details.

As a rule, judges are represented in every working group tasked with digital innovation, both at the Ministry of Justice level and within the SAC's individual projects. Their involvement ensures that technical solutions are aligned with the functional requirements of judicial work.
During the pilot phases of new software, selected judges provide feedback, which is used to refine user interfaces and system logic. While the technical implementation is usually managed by the Ministry of Justice, the functional parameters are defined by the judiciary to ensure that digital tools support judicial processes and maintain the independence of decision-making.
The SAC's current internal system is the most advanced within the jurisdiction; consequently, its architecture serves as a reference model for the development of

Co-funded by the European Union

nationwide judicial IT solutions. In the field of administrative justice, the SAC identifies the specific digital requirements of this branch.

A.VI – Use of AI systems in administrative justice

A.VI.1 – Tools and level of deployment

16. Are artificial intelligence systems currently used to assist in judicial or administrative activities?

The use of artificial intelligence within the Czech judiciary is currently limited and mostly in the pilot or testing phase. The focus is on supporting administrative efficiency and improving access to case-law rather than decision-making. Specific applications include:

- Chatbots: The Constitutional Court has recently launched a chatbot designed to assist the public and legal professionals in navigating and understanding its extensive case-law.
- Text Analysis and Case-law Research: While most internal databases currently rely on advanced keyword and metadata searches, there are ongoing efforts to integrate more sophisticated search tools to improve the efficiency of legal research. While certain AI tools like Microsoft Copilot are permitted, their use is decentralised and entirely optional for judicial staff. The judiciary maintains a cautious approach, ensuring that AI remains a supportive tool and does not impact the core deliberative process or judicial independence.
- Anonymisation of Decisions: Automated tools (such as „Anonymizér“) are increasingly used to assist court staff in redacting personal data from judgments before publication. However, these results always require final human validation.
- Speech-to-Text: Several courts are piloting AI-powered transcription software to assist in recording court hearings.

16a. If so, which ones are used? (Please tick all that apply)

X ☐ Chatbots

☐ Semantic search tools

X ☐ Automated anonymisation of decisions

X ☐ Text analysis and assistance with legal research

☐ Tools to assist with organisation and court management

Co-funded by the European Union

X ☐ Other (please specify)

AI-powered Speech-to-Text (automated transcription software), as mentioned above.

16b. Overall level of internal deployment of AI systems:

☐ Occasional or isolated use
X ☐ Trial phase
X ☐ Development phase
☐ Widespread use
☐ Full integration

Please explain if necessary:

The majority of AI-related initiatives, such as automated anonymisation tools and text analysis, are currently in the trial phase. However, as part of the ongoing development of the "e-Spis" (Electronic Judicial File) and "e-Správa" (Electronic Administration) systems, certain software functionalities are moving into the development phase. An example is the automated assignment of metadata to finalised judicial decisions, specifically the extraction and indexing of relevant statutory provisions and legal references used within the text.

A.VII – Governance, regulation and ethical framework for AI

A.VII.1 – Internal guidelines and regulatory compliance

17. Has your jurisdiction adopted any internal guidelines, charters or policies governing the use of AI systems, in particular in application of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act), the GDPR and other relevant European instruments?

X ☐ YES

☐ NO

If so, please specify which ones.

The Czech judiciary adheres to an internal regulatory framework, primarily governed by Instruction of the Ministry of Justice No. 11/2025 (amending Instruction No. 5/2022). This Instruction ensures that the use of artificial intelligence is in strict compliance with the GDPR and national legislation regarding cybersecurity, data protection, and the handling of classified or non-public information.
Annexed to this Instruction is the AI Usage Policy (effective from 15 December 2025). This policy establishes the fundamental principles for AI deployment, detailed rules for personal data protection, and clear lines of accountability for any use of AI systems that

Co-funded by the European Union

contradicts established standards. It also introduces mandatory protocols for staff training and competence development.
Furthermore, this policy distinguishes between officially approved AI tools and unapproved ones. In practice, for instance at the Supreme Administrative Court, data processing via AI is confined to a scope justified by identified and analysed risk profiles. This security framework is further reinforced by mandatory adherence to public warnings and advisories issued by the National Cyber and Information Security Agency (NÚKIB), which may lead to the exclusion of certain AI systems from use in the judiciary.

18. Are AI systems subject to prior risk assessments?
X ☐ YES

☐ NO

If so, please specify the terms of these assessments
The primary term of these assessments is mandatory compliance with national cybersecurity standards. Specifically, any AI system under consideration must not be subject to a security warning or public advisory issued by the National Cyber and Information Security Agency (NÚKIB). The issuance of such a warning by the national authority automatically excludes an AI system from use within the judiciary.
Furthermore, as part of the internal approval process, AI tools are evaluated against identified risk profiles to ensure that their deployment is consistent with the security requirements for handling judicial data.

19. Are there specific requirements in terms of transparency for the use of AI systems? If so, please provide details.

Transparency requirements within the Czech judiciary are primarily governed by the EU AI Act and the GDPR. Under the internal framework of Instruction No. 11/2025, transparency is ensured through several key principles:

- Human-in-the-loop: Since AI tools are strictly supportive and voluntary, the judge or staff member remains fully responsible for the final output. Transparency is maintained by the fact that all judicial decisions and official documents are issued and signed by a human authority, who must verify any AI-assisted content.
- Internal Governance: The distinction between officially approved and unapproved tools ensures that the judiciary maintains a transparent overview of which technologies are being utilised within the system.
- Interaction Disclosure: For public-facing AI applications, such as the Constitutional Court's chatbot, transparency is ensured by clearly informing users that they are interacting with an automated system and not a court official

20. Is the use of AI systems accompanied by human oversight mechanisms?

X ☐ YES

☐ NO

Co-funded by the European Union

If so, please provide details

Human oversight is a fundamental and mandatory requirement within the Czech judiciary, ensuring that artificial intelligence remains strictly a supportive tool under the "human-in-the-loop" principle. Judges maintain exclusive responsibility for all judicial decisions and legal reasoning, while administrative outputs, such as the automated anonymisation of judgments, must undergo manual verification and approval by court staff prior to publication. Furthermore, individual users remain personally and legally accountable for the accuracy of any AI-assisted work, thereby ensuring that technology does not compromise judicial independence or the integrity of the proceedings.

21. Are specific methodologies implemented during the design, development and deployment of AI systems to ensure their traceability, reliability, integrity and accuracy? If so, please provide details.

The Czech judiciary ensures the traceability and integrity of AI systems through the centralised management and approval processes of the Ministry of Justice. Under Instructions No. 11/2025 and No. 5/2022, only verified and officially approved AI tools are deployed within the justice sector's secure ICT environment. This framework ensures that all digital solutions meet mandatory organisational and technical standards for reliability, accuracy, and accountability.

A.VIII – Innovation, prospects and future needs

A.VIII.1 – Current innovation projects

22. Are there any innovation projects currently under way in the following areas? (please tick all that apply)

X ☐ Process automation
X ☐ System interoperability
X ☐ Modernisation of existing systems
X ☐ Advanced digital services for external users
X ☐ AI systems
☐ Other (please specify)

A.VIII.2 – Barriers to digital transformation

23 What do you consider to be the main barriers to the digital transformation of administrative justice? (please tick all that apply)

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ Complexity of the regulatory framework
X ☐ Insufficient financial resources
X ☐ Lack of specialised human resources
☐ Organisational complexity
☐ Resistance to change and digital skills gap
☐ Cybersecurity risks and challenges
☐ Other (please specify)

A.VIII.3 – Investment priorities

24. What do you think should be the priority areas for investment over the next few years? (please tick all that apply)

X ☐ Modernisation of infrastructure
X ☐ Cybersecurity
X ☐ Training and skills development
X ☐ Deployment of AI systems
X ☐ Interoperability at European level
X ☐ Complete digitalisation of administrative procedures
☐ Other (please specify)

25. Please describe one or more good practices in digitalisation that have been implemented or are planned within your jurisdiction.

The Czech judiciary has implemented several key digital practices to enhance efficiency, security, and transparency. These include:

- the Data Box system, which ensures secure and legally binding electronic delivery of documents between courts and legal professionals;
- the e-Spis/InfoSoud platforms, which provide real-time public access to case proceedings and statuses, allowing users to track key procedural milestones such as the initiation of a case, scheduled hearings, final rulings, and any related legal remedy proceedings;

Co-funded by the European Union

- the SAC case-law database including a highly advanced, public-facing case-law search engine, which allows for sophisticated full-text and metadata-based filtering. It provides the public with free, full-text searchable access to almost all decisions issued by administrative courts, including the legal "headnotes" (key summaries formulated for decisions of particular legal significance).

Part B
Automated administrative decisions and judicial review

B.I – Automated administrative decisions: substantive legality and procedure

1. Are there provisions in your legal system that authorise public administrations to use digital or algorithmic technologies in the exercise of their powers?

X ☐ YES

☐ NO

If so:

1.a. According to these provisions, what are the authorised tools and the objectives pursued by their use?

In the Czech Republic, the digital transformation of public administration is governed by a set of interconnected statutes that establish the right to digital interaction and the legal basis for automated administrative processes.

- Act No. 12/2020 Coll., on the Right to Digital Services. This act establishes the principle of "digital by default." It grants users of legal services the right to receive digital services from public authorities and imposes a corresponding obligation on those authorities to provide them. The objective is to ensure that administrative acts are performed electronically, effectively, and with minimal burden on the citizen (the "only once" principle).
- The infrastructure for digital exercise of power is regulated by Act No. 300/2008 Coll., on Electronic Acts and Authorized Conversion of Documents, which mandates the use of "Data Boxes" as the primary tool for official communication. This is complemented by Act No. 297/2016 Coll., on Trust Services for Electronic Transactions, which provides the tools for electronic signatures, seals, and time stamps, ensuring the legal certainty and non-repudiation of digital administrative acts.
- Act No. 365/2000 Coll., on Public Administration Information Systems, regulates the development and operation of the technological infrastructure. Specifically, Sections 8a and 8b define the role of "assisted contact points" (Czech POINT), which act as a bridge between the digital and physical worlds, ensuring that the use of technology does not exclude those with lower digital literacy. The objective here is the interoperability of systems and the accessibility of public administration data.

Co-funded by the European Union

- Regulated under Act No. 365/2000 Coll., on Public Administration Information Systems, and supported by Act No. 12/2020 Coll. (the "Digital Constitution"), the Citizen Portal serves as the authorized central interface for digital interaction with the state. It is the primary tool through which the administration exercises its power to provide services, allow the filing of applications, and provide access to registry data.
- pursuant to Act No. 250/2017 Coll., on Electronic Identification, the state authorizes the use of the Citizen Identity system. This platform manages various electronic identification means (such as BankID, eObčanka, or NIA ID). It is the mandatory tool for verifying the identity of persons in the digital environment, ensuring that the exercise of public power is directed at the correct, verified individual.
- Based on recent amendments to Act No. 269/2021 Coll., on Identity Cards, and integrated into the framework of the Act on the Right to Digital Services, the eDoklady application is the authorized tool for digital proof of identity. It allows public authorities (and later private entities) to verify a citizen's identity via a mobile device without the need for a physical plastic card.

The Czech legal system authorizes these tools to pursue the efficiency and speed, accessibility, transparency and traceability and administrative simplification.

1.b. What types of acts can be adopted using these technologies?
In particular, is the use of algorithms permitted for the adoption of administrative decisions involving discretionary powers?

The abovementioned tools are not intended for adoption of administrative decisions.

In Czech law, the use of algorithms is not excluded as such. However, where an administrative decision involves discretionary powers, an algorithm may serve only as a supporting tool and cannot replace the authority's own exercise of discretion. Highly automated decision-making is used in Czech practice in a mass, rule-based, and non-discretionary system such as the humanitarian benefits system or the acquisition of special long-term residence, which allows for online administration and fully automated assessment of claims, with predominantly electronic applications and a special procedural regime.

2. Are there provisions in your legal system governing the design, deployment and use of artificial intelligence systems employed by public administrations?

☐ YES

X ☐ NO

If so,

Co-funded by the European Union

2.a. what type of implementation measures are these? (for example, legislative or soft law):

The Czech Republic currently lacks a dedicated national legislative framework governing the design and deployment of AI systems by public authorities. The current approach is characterised by the following implementation measures and strategic phases. The state's efforts are guided by the National Artificial Intelligence Strategy of the Czech Republic (NAIS). Current funding and organisational efforts are directed towards supporting an innovative environment and research, developing strategic documents and pilot programmes, and building the necessary technical infrastructure.

The Czech Republic is moving towards a fully digitised case file system in public administration. These digital files are intended to be accessible electronically to the courts to streamline judicial review. These projects are currently in the public procurement phase. The focus is on creating a robust digital environment (digitisation of files) before implementing advanced algorithmic or AI-driven decision-making tools.

2.b. Is there an obligation for public administrations to inform the public or individuals about the use of AI systems?

No, there is no such obligation.

2.c. Are any authorities or bodies responsible for developing general rules or standards for the use of artificial intelligence within public administrations?

1. Ministry of Industry and Trade (MPO)
   The Ministry of Industry and Trade acts as the main national coordinator for artificial intelligence. It is responsible for the overall AI agenda including the coordination of AI-related activities across both the private and public sectors.
2. Digital and Information Agency (DIA)
   The DIA is the central body responsible for the digital transformation of public administration. Its role includes setting technical and methodological standards for digital services and information systems. The DIA is instrumental in ensuring that any digital or algorithmic tools used by the state are interoperable and comply with eGovernment standards.

3. What conditions must be met to ensure the legality of administrative procedures involving the use of artificial intelligence systems?

In particular:

Co-funded by the European Union

3.a. Is the decision-making administration required to indicate the type of algorithmic system used and its principal characteristics?

No

3.b. At what stage of the procedure must the administration provide information about the use of an algorithmic system and its characteristics?

-

3.c. Does the interested party have the opportunity to comment on or challenge the use or operation of the AI system before the final decision is made?

No

4. Are specific areas of administrative law in your country subject to express authorisation for the use of administrative decisions based on artificial intelligence systems?

No

5. Are there specific areas of administrative law in which the use of artificial intelligence systems for issuing administrative decisions is expressly prohibited?

There are no areas in which administrative decisions can be made using artificial intelligence.

B.II – Judicial review of automated administrative decisions

6. Does national case-law recognise the legality of automated administrative decisions?

☐ YES

X ☐ NO

Please explain if necessary:

If so:

6.a. What principles and conditions have been identified by national case-law as necessary for these decisions to be legally valid?

6.b. Have any limitations been identified with regard to the possibility of delegating the administration's decision-making power to algorithmic systems?

Co-funded by the European Union

6.c. In particular, which of the following principles must be respected, according to national case-law, when adopting an automated administrative decision? (Please tick all that apply)

☐ Principle of transparency
☐ Principle of non-exclusivity of human intervention ('human in the loop')
☐ Principle of non-discrimination
☐ Principle of knowledge and comprehensibility of algorithmic functioning
☐ Principle of attributing the decision to an authority vested with power
☐ Other (please specify)

7. Has national case-law ruled on the nature and legal classification of the algorithm or AI system used for administrative decision-making?

No

8. What are the limits of the judicial review that administrative judges can exercise over automated administrative decisions?

No.

9. According to national case-law, is the right of access to the algorithmic process that led to the automated administrative decision recognised?

☐ YES
X ☐ NO

If so:
9.a. What information relating to the AI system (data, logic, key parameters) must be made available to the party concerned?

Part C
Administrative judges and the use of artificial intelligence in the performance of judicial functions and in the decision-making process, in light of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the 'AI Act') and other European Union standards and regulations, such as the GDPR, the DSA, the DMA, etc.

Co-funded by the European Union

1. Does your country recognise, at constitutional level, principles that expressly refer to the use of artificial intelligence in the performance of judicial functions?

☐ YES

X ☐ NO

If so, please specify which ones

2. Has your country adopted or is it in the process of adopting national measures to implement Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act) concerning the use of artificial intelligence to support judicial decision-making, which is classified as a 'high-risk' activity (Annex III, point 8(a))?

X ☐ YES

☐ NO

If so:

2.a. What is the nature of these measures (legislative, regulatory, guidelines, soft-law instruments)?

The current government has not yet proposed the draft law or any other regulation to be adopted in the legislative process. However, a draft law was prepared during the previous legislative period and is likely to resurface (see in Czech https://mpo.gov.cz/cz/rozcestnik/pro-media/tiskove-zpravy/ mpo-pripravilo-navrh-zakona-o-umele-inteligenci--cilem-je-vytvorit-co-nejlepsi-prostredi-pro-rozvoj-ai-v-cesku--289653/). It does not explicitly address the use of artificial intelligence to support judicial decision-making. Following the EU regulation, the draft law specifies certain aspects of the approval of high-risk systems (*en bloc*).

2.b. For what purposes is the use of AI permitted? (Please tick all that apply)

☐ Research and interpretation of the law

☐ Research and assessment of the facts

☐ Application of the law to a specific factual situation

Co-funded by the European Union

☐ Administrative activities that are purely ancillary (recital 61 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689)

Please explain if necessary:

The regulation has not been adopted yet (see above).

2.c. What measures are taken to ensure human oversight (Article 14 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689)? In particular, under what conditions is the user able to ignore, cancel or override the result produced by the artificial intelligence system (Article 14(4)(d) of the AI Act), or to suspend or interrupt its use (Article 14(4)(d) of the AI Act)?

The regulation has not been adopted yet (see above).

2.d. What regulatory measures have been adopted to ensure the transparency, accuracy and robustness of the artificial intelligence system used (Articles 13 and 15 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 – the AI Act)?

The regulation has not been adopted yet (see above).

3. Are there any official forms of testing or use of artificial intelligence systems for decision-making or generating judicial decisions currently in place in your country?

☐ YES

X ☐ NO

Please explain if necessary:

If so:

3.a What do they consist of?

3.b. What data sets are used?

Co-funded by the European Union

3.c. Is the software used publicly owned or provided by private operators?

3.d. Have any biases been identified in its operation? If so, what kind?

4. Are measures planned in your country to ensure a sufficient level of artificial intelligence literacy specifically for judges (Article 4 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689)?
☐ YES

X ☐ NO

If so:

4.a. What do these measures consist of?

4.b. Is specific training planned to prevent or limit the phenomenon known as 'automation bias' (Article 14(4)(b) of the AI Act)?

☐ YES

☐ NO

Please explain if necessary:

5. Is the use of generative or agentic artificial intelligence systems permitted in your country to assist in the drafting of procedural documents or court decisions?

It is not forbidden which means that the judges can in principle use any tools including generative or agentic AI to assist in the drafting official documents provided such use does not violate information security and the GDPR restrictions.

To help you understand the question better: **generative artificial intelligence (AI)** is a category of AI models which, thanks to machine learning and training on vast amounts of data, are capable of creating original content (text, images, videos, music, etc.). **Agentic AI** is described as a system capable of autonomously planning, making decisions and executing complex tasks with minimal human intervention to achieve a defined objective [source: OECD].

Co-funded by the European Union

6. Has the national case law of your country addressed issues concerning the interpretation and application of EU Regulation 2024/1689?

☐ YES

X ☐ NO

Please explain if necessary:

6.a. If yes, which principles have been established?

7. Have national courts of your country submitted preliminary rulings to the Court of Justice of the European Union regarding EU Regulation 2024/1689?

☐ YES

X ☐ NO

Please explain if necessary:

7.a. If yes, which questions were referred? What answers has the Court of Justice of the European Union provided?

Co-funded by the European Union